DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 305 SP 037 609

AUTHOR Wyett, Jerry L.
TITLE New Teachers for a New Mission: Democratic Classrooms. Working Paper Session.
PUB DATE 1997-02-00
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Washington, DC, February 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; *Democratic Values; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Empathy; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Standards; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Competencies; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Authenticity; *Respect

ABSTRACT

In exploring the need for and the obstacles to creating more democratic classrooms this paper maintains that the goal of national and state accrediting agencies and schools of education is to produce good teachers who would perpetuate the current teacher-dominated system. The heavy emphasis on developing competencies and methodologies ignores the fact that teachers will not be successful unless their students perceive them as real persons. A number of researchers have moved away from the competency model of identifying effective teaching. They have identified characteristics and behaviors such as authenticity, respect, and empathy that have a tremendous impact on the effectiveness of teachers both interpersonally and academically. Each of these characteristics can be broken down and their impact on teacher behavior characterized on a 5-point scale from very ineffective to extremely effective. Studies have shown that the levels of these characteristics and interpersonal skills generally found among teachers fall into the ineffective range. Based on the research outlined, it is argued that teacher education institutions must rethink their selection, recruitment, and training policies and that state and national certification and accreditation bodies must find new ways to examine and evaluate progress. (Contains 13 references.) (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 413 305

New Teachers for a New Mission:

Democratic Classrooms

Working Paper Session

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ATE Conference
February 1997
Washington, D.C.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. J. Wyett
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

by

Jerry L. Wyett, Ed.D.
Indiana University East
Richmond, IN 47374

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Booth 5

New Teachers for a New Mission: Democratic Classrooms

Efforts to upgrade standards and produce better schools and better teachers are mostly good. They are however, incomplete. As a result, they sap our energy and cloud our vision about the real priority we must address: namely, a different kind of school which will allow different kinds of teachers and different kinds of students to work on a common problem... successful living in a democracy. This issue must be addressed. Failure to do so may prove a life threatening blow to our democratic way of life.

Far from being democratic, the existing educational establishment is essentially authoritarian. The teacher is the fundamental instrument of control and hence is the final authority in regard to what actually happens in individual classrooms. This characterization is not intended to belittle the role of the teacher or to undermine the importance of the position, but rather to characterize the reality. It is further intended to underscore the fact that this system leaves little room for the kind of democratic involvement of students which is advocated by proponents of democratic classrooms. This description is also the playing field upon which all attempts at reform must be carried out.

Classroom teachers are the products of classrooms. While this is self-evident, it is also meaningful to explore its significance. In my teacher education classes for many years, I have asked my students to close their eyes and recall the best teacher they ever had. Invariably they report that a favorite teacher comes to mind. They further report that, almost without exception, this person was very influential in their decision to become a teacher. This sort of modeling is very powerful in the professional

development of young teachers. This, when coupled with the fact that most teachers are people who experienced significant success in the traditional school environment, makes teachers powerful advocates of the status quo.

It is not just that teachers "guard their turf", this is not necessarily undesirable, but it goes much deeper than that. Teachers as a group really believe, at the most basic level, in the teacher dominated system which characterizes our common schools. This is the system which has worked so well for them. It is only natural then that teachers are very reluctant to change. It is not that they lack understanding or the desire to do what is best for children, but rather that they believe, often passionately, that what was best for them is best for all children.

They fit well into a system which puts the teacher in front of the classroom delivering information and requiring that students master and regurgitate that information. They were typically stimulated and seldom lost or overwhelmed by their own education. More often than not, they sat in the front of the room, maintained eye contact with the teacher, were the benefactors of significant praise and approval from the teacher, and in general were happy and successful in school. Rarely were they aware that many of their classmates seated behind them found school to be a very different and often less hospitable place. This is not intended as a criticism of teachers, but rather as an explanation of why it is so difficult to reform education. The people who control the enterprise and who have the power and authority to change it are invested in keeping things just as they are. The status quo is what worked for them – it is indeed what they aspired to and what they now have come to control.

It is not difficult to see why persons so educated often believe that the solution to educational problems is just to continue to do the same things, only do them harder. Hence, the love affair between many teachers and programs for the gifted and talented and the continued popularity of tracking even in the face of volumes of research regarding its lack of merit. (George, 1988). It is simply true that to change a person's perception about an issue we must arrange to change their experience. Years and years of success as a student do not produce a group of people who are excited about changing the institution which brought them the success. Given that they have now paid the price to gain control of the enterprise and are at long last in charge, the potential for reform is even further diminished.

The past 35 years have seen an almost endless array of proposals which purport to represent reforms in education. Richard Gibbony makes an interesting observation in The Stone Trumpet which I believe speaks powerfully to the problem of those who are the educational establishment trying to change it:

> "if there had been no fundamental reform since 1960, and there is virtually none now, as I believed, why were not more people saying something about it? There is no sustained and critical stream in the literature that speaks to this condition. What was too often there was the irrelevant happy talk of policy studies, or the forced tapestries made by those who stitched together patches of little studies on the change process, or the bold pronouncements of those selling one reform nostrum or another, be it mastery learning, cooperative learning or programmed instruction." (Gibbony, 1994, p. 223).

The problem of creating more democratic classrooms I believe is even further compounded by the fact that many teachers see very little need to utilize the classroom as a laboratory for instruction in democratic living. As is the problem of academic

instruction colored by their own experience, so also is the issue of education for citizenship. Many teachers are middle class, conservative, and family oriented. Their attitudes, values, and behaviors were often taught in more traditional family structures than those experienced by many of their current students. They are often the first generation to attend college. They have been taught a middle class work ethic. This ethic is deep within the fiber of their being and holds that anyone can achieve if they are willing to work hard and conform to the society's values. These values are often in conflict with the children they teach who increasingly come from families where they are taught very different attitudes and values. The resultant clash of values and attitudes between students and teachers almost inevitably leads to mutual lack of respect and alienation.

The problem outlined above is made more difficult to resolve because it is so deeply ingrained in the psyche of the individual teacher and hence of the educational establishment. It operates unconsciously and therefore is very difficult to approach. When asked to behave differently, teachers are resistant – not because they wish to obstruct, but simply because their background and experience interfere with their ability to see the need for a change. This issue is so pervasive that it completely dominates the efforts to such organizations as NCATE, whose stated purpose is to upgrade the standards for teacher certification, and NBPTS, which seeks to develop high standards for voluntary "Board Certification" for teachers. Both of these groups make it clear that their essential goal is to produce teachers who are more skilled at doing what I believe has already proven to be short of the goal of producing more democratic classrooms. Their proposals do not address two issues:

1) The quality of persons being educated in terms of their belief in and practice of democratic values; and
2) The character structure of the individual teacher in terms of attitudes toward and ability to engage in positive relationships with students.

Helping our children to achieve higher scores on standardized tests, while perhaps a desirable goal, will not make them more efficient in living together and becoming self-actualized in an increasingly complex and diverse social order. While providing good spellers and good readers are important goals, they are not enough. What is also needed are better parents, better workers, better neighbors, better friends: In short, better citizens to help solve the problems of life on our increasingly smaller planet.

In order to achieve this we need to pay more attention to the person we are educating to be a teacher. We need to do this because it is the human experience of being a part of someone else's life in a deeply personal and emotional way which separates those teachers who truly impact the lives of students from those who remain anonymous and fade into oblivion with the passage of time. It is the interjection of the humanness of the teacher into the life stream of the student which produces real significant and lasting growth. It is the caring, personal quality of the relationship which students have with teachers which changes lives and is reported over and over by students who talk about teachers who affected their lives.

The heavy emphasis upon developing competencies and methodologies which dominates teacher education simply ignores this fact. No matter how many methods of instruction are learned in teacher education courses or how many competencies are added to the list of things teachers should "know and be able to do", a teacher cannot and will not be successful until and unless they are perceived by their students as a real person. A

good teacher is first and foremost a unique personality who has learned to use self in the execution of their art. Since each teacher is unique in the ability to do this, the relentless search for a common set of competencies for all teachers is not only folly, it is doomed to failure. Clearly, a more productive direction for teacher education would be one in which we devised programs to assist prospective teachers to develop their own unique qualities as opposed to trying to identify and emulate methods and competencies which have worked for other unique personalities and which may be totally inappropriate for other individuals and situation.

Almost without exception each of us can identify "good" or "bad" teachers from our own experience. It is almost impossible however to agree on what that person did or did not do to earn the distinction. We are invariably left with the realization that a good teacher does not behave in a certain way. What makes a good teacher is that his or her unique approach to a given situation produces a desirable outcome for the person who is making the judgment.

A variety of influences in the past three decades have led to very significant changes in teacher education. Unfortunately, the changes have been, almost without exception, directed toward a scholarship-competency model for training teachers. Little attention has been given to a model of teacher education which emphasizes the teacher as a person.

None of this is surprising given the common assumption that the basic job of the teacher is to impart information to students. In the mind of most educational reformers, it follows that the more proficient a person has been at accumulating information and the more information that has been accumulated, the better prepared that individual will be to

teach. I believe this assumption is wrong. It ignores the fundamental importance of the interpersonal relationship in the success of the student.

The important issue in educational reform then is to be certain that we are looking in the right place. We need to look at the students who come to our schools as they really are, not as we would like them to be. We need to look at the teachers as they really are, not as we would like them to be. We need to look at our schools as a part of the life of our students and not as preparation for their life. Students come to school in search of meaning about the real world in which they live. Teachers must be prepared to meet students in their real world. Schools need to be about life, not just preparation for life. Failure to recognize this undermines any attempt at meaningful reform because it creates an environment in which students and teachers are adversaries rather than partners. The dramatic differences in human contact today's children have when compared to previous generations, demands teachers who are trained not only in subject matter but in developing relationships with their students and helping their students to develop skills in working and living with each other.

The search by students for meaning and a greater understanding about life is the engine that drives their very existence. It is this search which provides the only truly legitimate role for the school. Schools do not derive their legitimacy by teaching reading and writing and ciphering even through it is obvious that students will not have meaningful lives if they do not master these skills. The legitimacy of the school must come from helping students not only know more but also be more. Schools need to help students answer the important ongoing questions in their own lives, to find their own way, and to make meaning out of what they experience. Since experiences differ, so will

meaning. We must abandon the outmoded notion that only one meaning exists and only one answer is correct. Opportunities for students to find this meaning in their family structure often have been greatly limited. The apprenticeship for adulthood previously supplied by the family is no longer happening for many of our children. Teachers must be reeducated and schools must be restructured to help fill this void. Children cannot raise themselves and our democratic society cannot survive continuing generations of young people who fail to act with social responsibility.

If we truly want to reform American education, we must break this pattern. We must begin to develop a different kind of teacher -- one with different skills, attitudes and beliefs. We have the research and the methodology to do this. The questions remains whether we have the will. According to Carl Rogers:

> "We possess a very considerable knowledge of the conditions which encourage self-initiated, significant, experiential, "gut-level" learning by the whole person. We do not frequently see these conditions put into effect because they mean a real revolution in our approach to education and revolutions are not for the timid. But we do find examples of this revolution in action.
>
> We know... that the initiation of such learning rests not upon the teaching skills of the leader, not upon his scholarly knowledge of the field, not upon his curricular planning, not upon his use of audio-visual aids, not upon the programmed learning he utilizes, not upon his lectures and presentations, not upon an abundance of books, though each of these might at one time or another be utilized as an important resource. No, the facilitation of significant learning rests upon certain attitudinal qualities which exist in the personal relationship between the facilitator and the learner." (Rogers, 1967, p. 2).

It is abundantly clear that the energy of the educational establishment through such agents as NCATE and NBPTS are concentrating their efforts to reform education in the direction of the very things Rogers says make no difference and ignoring the things

which do make a difference. It is no wonder that efforts to reform education have proven so futile. It is not possible to get to our destination if we do not get on the right road.

Carl Rogers says, "Teaching is a vastly overrated function." (Rogers, 1967, p. 1). The real issues which underlie success in teaching are more related to what a teacher "is" and how the teacher relates to the student than they are to what a teacher "knows". Success in relating to students is a matter of values, beliefs and attitudes much more that it is a matter of imparting knowledge. There exists substantial credible evidence to support this position.

A number of researchers, among them Aspy (1976, 1977, 1986), Roebuck (1983), Rogers (1967, 1983), and Carkhuff (1977, 1986), have done extensive work in the identification and analysis of effective teaching. These scholars have identified measurable and quantifiable characteristics which hold substantial promise for genuine reform in both teacher education and in the practices of schools. It is serious research, ongoing for more than 40 years. It has been conducted in 42 states and seven countries and covers over 200,000 hours of classroom interactions. The findings of this research are:

1) statistically significant;
2) consistent across grade levels;
3) consistent across subject areas;
4) consistent across regions of the United States;
5) consistent across cultures; and
6) based on more analyses of classroom variables and on more subjects than virtually any other area of investigation in the field of education. (Render, 1985, p. 235).

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the research lies in the fact that it takes us away from the competencies model of identifying effective teaching. In spite of reams of research dedicated to identifying the good teacher based on methodology, we are always returned to the starting point with more questions than we have answers. Apparently it

just is not possible to identify and qualify "good" or "bad" methods of teaching. Such terms as "good" or "bad" may be applied to outcomes, but not to the process used to achieve these outcomes. Good teachers can be judged by their results, but not by the means used to achieve these results. This, of course, does not apply permission to abuse or mistreat children. We are led inescapably to the conclusion that teaching is too dynamic, too personal, and too subjective to lend itself to our efforts to analyze and quantify it without regard to its personal dimension.

In spite of this, we somehow find ourselves in the unenviable position of not trusting things which are subjective. This in turn takes us back to trying to quantify them, and we go around in circles again and again. This has led us to the point where we as a profession are virtually paralyzed in our efforts to make any real progress in changing how we do things in spite of the fact that the proverbial wolf is at the door ready and anxious to "blow our house down".

Teaching takes place in the context of a relationship between teachers and students. It is up close and personal. The relationship is a living dynamic entity which encompasses the values, attitudes, feelings, and behaviors of both the teacher and the student. It is far more spontaneous than it is methodical. It is immediate. Teachers make thousands of decisions daily – each of which impacts not only the particular student involved, but every other student in the classroom and often others who are not even present. In this arena, it is not just the behavior of the teacher or the methods which the teacher employs which are important. The perceptions of the meaning of behavior become even more crucial to teacher and student alike. Everything which happens is interpreted differently by each party to the enterprise, and meaning is attached and evaluated uniquely.

If we are to be successful in helping teachers to be more effective it is essential that we understand that the entire game is played at a level which is personal, unique, and subjective. Each person in the enterprise evaluates what is going on from a very

different prospective and sifts the data to make this evaluation through a very different filter. This of course explains why a competency approach is so limited. What may work well for one person does not work for another. What may work well in one situation does not work for another. Hence, the "bag of tricks" approach to teaching always leaves us holding a bag which does not have a trick to fit the situation we need.

A teacher is first and foremost a person. A student is likewise first and foremost a person. The most basic and fundamental things which happen between teachers and students are personal. It is in the context of the interpersonal relationship between teachers and students that all learning is enhanced or inhibited. Nothing of significance happens which does not cross the bridge of feelings which exists between them. In the context of this understanding, truly effective teacher education must begin by helping pre-service teachers develop the skills needed to establish effective relationships. They must learn how to build the bridges. When this is achieved, problems such as classroom management, curriculum planning, and evaluation are placed in a meaningful context.

The research has shown certain behaviors which teachers exhibit to greatly enhance the development of successful relationships and hence, the success of their students. These behaviors are:

Authenticity:	The ability to be genuine or real: to be who one truly is and behave in accordance with one's true feelings.
Respect:	The ability to see all people as worthy of positive regard and to treat them with respect at all times.
Empathy:	The ability to feel what someone else is feeling: to identify, understand, and appropriately respond to another person's needs.

These characteristics, authenticity, respect, and empathy have been shown to have a tremendous impact on the effectiveness of teachers both interpersonally and

academically. (Render, 1985). The overwhelming weight of evidence of this effectiveness should put the development of these characteristics in teachers at the forefront of every teacher education program in our country. Unfortunately, such is not the case.

Authenticity

In order for any relationship to be successful and to promote the well being and growth of the parties involved, it must be built upon a foundation of honesty and trust. These characteristics are simply fundamental to successful interpersonal relations. When the actions of persons are not open, honest, forthright, and genuine, they invite suspicion, mistrust, and loss of respect.

Anyone who has encountered another human being, be it their spouse, parent, or child, and felt that something was wrong with the person has experienced the frustration that accompanies the inquiry into their well being which is answered with the response that "nothing is wrong". We all know how frustrating it is to know that what a person is saying is not congruent with what they are feeling. These encounters invite probing, testing, and often hostility.

Students need to know that their teachers are emotionally reliable. They need to experience, at a feeling level, that their interactions with teachers are genuine and that they do not have to guess about the important issues which will affect their relationships with these people who have such power and impact on their lives. As children develop and grow no skill is more important than the ability to learn how to relate to other people. Authority figures are among the most important to learn about.

In many circles teachers are advised to avoid genuine relationships with students. They are encouraged to camouflage their personal feelings and to deny their basic humanity, i.e., to be unreal and to hide behind their "teacher mask"; to put on their "teacher face". I remember as a young teacher being given the advice, "Don't smile until

Christmas. If you give them an inch, they will take a mile, etc., etc." It is indeed sad at a time when young people so desperately need reliable models that the models are being encouraged to be plastic and inaccessible.

The opposite of authentic or genuine is spurious, counterfeit, or false. How can we expect to impact the lives of children in a positive way and to help them learn about the fundamental principles of living in a democratic society when we as their leaders, mentors, teachers, and models are spurious and phony in relating to them.

The most obvious casualty in these counterfeit relationships is the sense of trust which is sacrificed. Teachers often do this in the false belief that this will help them to maintain order. At best it only helps them to achieve a short-term measure of control. This is the antithesis of democracy. In authoritarian organizations, rulers seeks to control their subjects. In a democracy, leaders derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. In a society which supports and encourages democratic ideals and practices, there is no room for authoritarianism. It is the opposite of what we try to achieve. When we sacrifice the principles of democracy and good human relations for the short-term goal of order and control, we neither deserve nor get either.

Respect

In a democratic society, an appreciation of the inherent worth of every person is most fundamental. Our belief in the dignity of our fellowman and our unconditional regard for each person's rights is a principle whose acceptance is absolutely basic. We hold every person to be equal to every other. No one is supposed to be more equal as a result of status, privilege, or circumstance of life. Each individual is held in highest esteem and is to be afforded courteous regard by their fellowman. Perhaps no statement by the framers of our democratic system is held in more high regard than the following by Thomas Jefferson from the Declaration of Independence:

> "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuant of happiness."

This passage has been used for generations to assert the importance of each individual and to underscore the intent of the founding fathers to place respect for the individual as both fundamental and central to democratic living.

Children who are to live successfully in a democracy must learn to develop an unswerving belief in and loyalty to the principles of respect for human dignity and equality. Authoritarian classrooms in which respect for individuals is not practiced, or worse violated, send the wrong message to students. They establish artificial barriers between students and teachers and between students and students. Not only do they fail to teach the critical skills of democratic living, they undermine the essential foundation upon which they must be built. Teachers who fail to respect their students and engage in the all too frequently seen practice of demeaning and degrading students as a means of maintaining control send the most undemocratic message of all. Namely, students are unworthy of respect and external power is the essential mechanism of maintaining control. Compliance is the goal of a totalitarian government. Community is the goal of democracy.

Lack of respect obviously has no place in the development of democratic ideals and practices. In spite of the obvious harm in this approach to students, even the casual visitor to virtually any school in America will observe the repeated instances of disrespect which so often characterize teacher-student interaction. In an environment where teachers fail to show proper respect for students, students answer in kind. Attacks upon teachers and assaults of a violent nature are commonplace in many of our schools.

No issue is more fundamental to democratic living than the idea that each individual has an absolute right to feel and to be secure in their person. We must therefore have a zero tolerance for violence in our schools. We cannot, however, expect to raise children in an environment where they are abused physically, sexually, and

emotionally in their homes, subjected constantly to violence in their music, movies, television, and sports and media models, and not expect them to react violently to authority figures who treat them with lack of respect. We must insist that children demonstrate proper respect for their teachers and for each other. Those in authority must carefully model this behavior and be unswerving in their dedication to its importance. In a world where discipline and self-respect are foreign to many children and where their models are often exactly the opposite, schools must be vigilant and uncompromising in their dedication to teaching this principle.

Empathy

The basic humanness of each of us develops in large part as a result of the acceptance, nurture, love, and unconditional positive regard we experience from other people. The earlier, the deeper, and the more abundant this nurture, the more open, trusting, respectful, and self-actualized person we can expect to find in our classroom. Unfortunately, large numbers of our students do not come to school so equipped. We must, true to our calling, accept responsibility for remediating those skills which we value and which our students do not possess. Certainly we have precedence for supporting this mission of remediation. Billions of dollars have been and are being spent to identify and work with "at risk" students in areas such as math and reading. Head Start and Title I programs have provided significant resources to schools in the hopes that disadvantaged students will become more capable academically. Unfortunately, this approach represents the opposite side of the same coin which causes the competency model of teacher training to be so inadequate in producing any significant change in teacher education. Pouring billions of dollars into academic training for children who are deprived of the most basic building blocks of their humanness does not properly address the real issue. Emotional well being is fundamental to successful humanization of the emerging person. Countless children in our society are not getting their basic physical

and emotional needs met. Concentrating on their intellectual needs without first attending to their physical and emotional needs is wrong. The clamor to address this through academic remediation as the initial priority represents doing the wrong thing harder. The educational establishment is consistent. Well intentioned though it may be, it continues to look in the wrong place.

What is needed are teachers who can identify with and resonate at a feeling level with the life situations from which children come. We need teachers who accept not just intellectually but emotionally that most of the students in their classes are different from themselves. They have not learned the same value system and work ethic that characterized the family structure and upbringing of previous generations. Often the values and ethics they are learning are antithetical to life in a democracy. They must be taught a different system of values. These must be taught by teachers whose ability to resonate with the feelings as well as the motives which drive students is highly developed.

Our current system of teacher education is not providing us with persons who have this training and background. If we do not address this issue, we will continue to miss the mark. Our efforts will ultimately fail regardless of how good they look on the surface.

When I was in college I worked in an automobile collision shop. The boss was adamant in his admonition that all surfaces which were to be painted must be totally free of underlying rust and dirt. If they were not thoroughly clean, the decay would come back no matter how good the paint job initially looked. The same principle is true of education. We must not continue to dress the surface and ignore the underlying foundations.

These interpersonal skills, authenticity, empathy, and respect, can be broken down to five levels and the impact on teacher behavior can be characterized as follows:

Level 1: Very ineffective (crippling)
Level 2: Ineffective (hurting)
Level 3: Minimally effective
Level 4: Very effective (adding significantly)
Level 5: Extremely effective (adding, encouraging, and exploring) (Render, 1985, p. 238).

Clearly if we pay attention to this research, we would want to take whatever action was necessary to insure that students were not subjected to Level 1, 2, and 3 teachers. We would strive to make certain that all teachers operated at Levels 4 and 5. Teachers who failed to exhibit sensitivity and caring towards children or who were unable or unwilling to be real and genuine human beings would not be acceptable. Teachers who berated or demeaned their students in attempts to achieve or maintain control would be guilty of malpractice. Unfortunately, this is not the case. In virtually every school in America, children are routinely punished, put down, embarrassed, demeaned, ridiculed and generally mistreated by teachers who lack the interpersonal skills described above. In our teacher education programs, we continue to concern ourselves with how many credit hours our graduates accumulate, whether or not they can pass tests such as the National Teacher Exam, and if they have the proper sequence of courses to satisfy the external accrediting agencies.

Given that no one seems to be paying any attention to these critical issues, it is no wonder that over the years the following findings have emerged:

1) The average level of empathy, congruence, and positive regard among teachers is about the same as the general population or the "person on the street";
2) The average level of interpersonal skills for teachers is below 2.0 (2.2-2.3):
3) The average level of interpersonal skills for principals and counselors is below 3.0;
4) The average level of interpersonal skills for professors of teacher education is below 3.0;
5) Discipline problems can be predicted if a teacher's interpersonal level is known; and
6) There are five retarding teachers for every one facilitating teacher in a typical school. (Render, 1985, p. 239).

If we truly examine the meaning of these findings, the results are rather disturbing. The average level of interpersonal skills for teachers falls into the ineffective range (2.2-2.3). The principals who supervise them are no better and neither are the professors who trained them. If teachers are ineffective in their relationships with students, the students misbehave. In the typical school, the ineffective teachers outnumber the facilitating teachers by a margin of 5 to 1.

Since our schools have become the major influence in the socialization of our nation's children, is it any wonder that our schools are under attack and that the reformers who seek only to improve academic achievement have utterly and completely failed in their efforts?

On the other hand, when teachers operate at the 3.0+ level, the results can be truly amazing. The students of facilitative teachers:

1) Miss fewer days of school;
2) Score higher on self-concept measures;
3) Make greater gains on standardized achievement measures in math and reading;
4) Present fewer discipline problems;
5) Commit fewer acts of vandalism;
6) Have increased scores on intelligence measures;
7) Make gains in creativity scores;
8) Behave more spontaneously;
9) Exhibit higher levels of thinking(analysis, synthesis, and evaluation on Bloom's taxonomy).
10) Exhibit more student talk'
11) Do more problem solving;
12) Exhibit more verbal initiation
13) Ask more questions
14) Are more involved in learning;
15) Have more eye contact with the teacher;
16) Exhibit more physical movement; and
17) Exhibit fewer feelings of anxiety. (Render, 1985, p. 241).

In short, students not only demonstrate greater development of academic skills but also show growth in the personal and social skills which are so necessary for democratic

living. The implications of this are far-reaching! It is now possible to identify certain behaviors in teachers which facilitate student growth. It is possible to help prospective teachers develop these behaviors. The results achieved by teachers who exhibit these behaviors are dramatic.

It is a given that teachers need to be intelligent, knowledgeable, and well educated. It is not enough, however, to promote these qualities in the absence of giving equal attention to the values, attitudes and personality characteristics of the prospective teacher.

There is not now, nor has there ever been, a shortage of ideas or suggestions from the critics of the educational establishment. What is in short supply is the kind of teacher who can take these concepts and create a classroom environment which will allow children to incorporate the ideas into their lives in meaningful ways which promote maximum individual growth and truly serve the needs of both the student and a democratic society. I believe the research outlined above can help to "look in the right place." In order for us to do so, teachers will have to look honestly and realistically at themselves and how they approach their classroom. They will have to be willing to reexamine what they do and how they do it.

Teacher education institutions will have to look at how they select, recruit and train teachers. New standards will have to be established and new skills developed. The accumulation of credits can no longer be the essential measure of program completion. Pre-service teachers will need to be able to demonstrate high levels of interpersonal skills as a condition of certification.

State and national certification and accreditation bodies will have to rethink their narrow agendas and find new ways to examine and evaluate programs. The simplistic notion that teaching can be evaluated simply by the number of credit hours accumulated, the exams passed, and the grade point average earned is outdated and outmoded. We must begin to look at teacher behavior in much broader terms and in light of the far-

reaching implications of how teachers relate to students. We can no longer afford to run our educational enterprise from pre-school through graduate school without carefully considering the level of authenticity, empathy and respect each of its members exhibits. In a democratic society which relies on its members to work cooperatively and value each other, anything less is unacceptable.

REFERENCES

Aspy, D.N. 1986. This Is School: Sit Down and Listen. Amherst, Mass.: Human Resource Development Press.

Aspy, D.N., and Roebuck., F.N. 1977. Kids Don't Learn From People They Don't Like. Amherst, Mass.: Human Resource Development Press.

Aspy, D.N., and Roebuck., F.N. 1976. A Lever Long Enough. Dallas, Tex.: National Consortium for Humanizing Education.

Aspy, D.N.. 1972. Toward a Technology for Humanizing Education. Champaign, Ill.: Research Press.

Carkhuff, R.R. 1986. "Learning In the Age of Information." Education, Summer 106: 264-267.

Carkhuff, R.R., Berenson, D.N., and Pierce, R.M. 1977. The Skills of Teaching: Interpersonal Skills. Amherst, Mass.: Human Resource Development Press.

George, Paul S. 1988. "Whats the Truth About Tracking and Ability Grouping Really???" Gainesville, Fl.: Teacher Education Resources: University of Florida.

Gibboney, Richard A. 1994. The Stone Trumpet. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Render, G.F. 1985. "Research in Humanistic Education: Implications for Teacher Preparation." In J.A. Braun (Ed.), Reforming Teacher Education, Issues and New Directions (pp. 233-251). New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Roebuck, F.N., and Aspy, C.B. May 1987. "Changes in Teachers' Behaviors and Perceptions of Self and Students After Training in Carkhuff's Program Development." Person-Centered Review.

Roebuck, F.N. April 1983. "Strategies for Person-Centered Education." Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Montreal.

Rogers, C.R. 1983. Freedom to Learn for the 80's. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Rogers, C.R. 1967. "The Interpersonal Relationship in the Facilitation of Learning." In R.R. Leeper (Ed.), Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process, Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.